

REMARKS

During the interview conducted on February 19, 2003, the following points were made.

1. First, the Examiner objected to the submission of an amendment to claim 12 in the Applicants' response to the Office Action dated October 3, 2001, which Applicant filed on January 14, 2002. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the format that Applicant used for presentation of amended claim 12. The Examiner advised that, according to MPEP 1453 and Rule 173, the entire claim must be underlined since it is a new claim, even though it is being amended.

In reply, Applicant is herewith submit a revision to claim 12, as previously submitted on January 14, 2002, but with the entire claim underlined. The entire content of the amendment previously submitted is otherwise affirmed and incorporated herein by reference.

Second, the Examiner advised that the original patent has not been surrendered, even though a proper offer of surrender had been made. The Examiner required submission of the patent or an appropriate paper that requests replacement of the patent if it cannot be found or is lost or destroyed.

In reply, Applicant also is submitting herewith a Reissue Patent Application Statement As To Loss Of Original Patent, executed by an Officer of Samsung Electronics Company, Ltd., the assignee of all right title and interest to the patent by assignment of the inventors, as evidenced by a Certificate under 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b), submitted in the present reissue application on November 8, 2000.

Third, the Examiner also advised that a substitute reissue declaration must be submitted that identifies at least one error that has been found since the original filing of the reissue application and the original reissue declaration.

In reply, Applicant is submitting herewith a Supplemental Reissue Declaration of each of the inventors, which identifies at least one error that necessitated the amendment of claim 12 as now presented in the reissue application. It should be noted that a separate declaration is being submitted for each of the two inventors. The declaration signed by Mr. JEONG had been signed by Mr. JO as well, but his signature was not dated. Accordingly, a second separate declaration from Mr. JO was obtained.


Finally, Applicant believes that it now has complied with all of the Examiner's requirements, and respectfully requests that the application be passed to issue. Should any issues arise, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned as soon as possible.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

Date: April 17, 2003

APR 17 2003

APPENDIX - B

VERSION WITH MARKINGS SHOWING CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

12. (Amended) An adaptive variable-length decoding method for decoding the data coded by an adaptive variable-length coding method, in a decoding system for image data, said decoding method comprising the steps of:

receiving intra/inter mode information;

receiving quantization step size information;

detecting scanning position information;

selecting one of a plurality of variable-length decoding tables according to said intra/inter mode information, quantization step size information and scanning position information; and

variable-length decoding the data received according to said selected variable-length decoding table.